



**STATE OF WASHINGTON
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR STANDARDS BOARD**

Old Capitol Building, PO Box 47236 · Olympia, WA 98504-3113 · (360) 586-4465

**January 8-9, 2002
ESD 113 – Board Room
Olympia, Washington**

January 8, 2002

Members Present:	Tom Charouhas, Chair	Elaine Aoki
	Carolyn Bradley	Carol Coar
	Nancy Diaz-Miller	Ken Evans
	Sheila Fox	Tim Knue
	Gary Livingston	Kathryn Nelson
	Helen Nelson-Throssell	Martha Rice
	Ron Scutt	Karen Simpson
	Yvonne Ullas	Dennis Sterner

Members Absent: Terry Bergeson

Staff Present:	Jennifer Wallace	Pamela Abbott
	David Anderson	

Chair Charouhas called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

AGENDA

The Board reviewed and approved the agenda for both days.

MINUTES

MOTION: Moved by Tim Knue and seconded by Martha Rice to postpone the approval of the November and December minutes until January 9, 2002. **The motion passed unanimously.**

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification – Partnership Grant Program

Jennifer Wallace updated the members on the status of the Alternative Routes Partnerships.

- The state funding allowed for 64 candidates – divided as follows

Partnership	Route 1	Route 2	Route 3	TOTAL
ESD 112	9	5	5	19
South Sound	15	7	7	29
Puget Sound		8	8	16

Stipends and Tuition Assistance for Interns and Mentors:

- BA+0 cell is generated for each intern; 80% must be given to the intern 20% to the mentor.
- Tuition assistance for route 1 & 2 candidates is \$4000.

Transition to Teaching Grant Program

- Washington received 1.2 million, the largest state grant. The proposal was based entirely on route 3 from the alternative routes to teacher certification recommendations.
- This program differs in that the interns will only receive \$8000 and mentors will \$500. This program will fund roughly 100 candidates.
- The RFP has been drafted and OSPI will send this out by January 15, 2002. The PESB and OSPI will be encouraging those who submitted proposals for the state grant to reapply.
- Deadline to submit a proposal is March 15, 2002.
- A planning meeting for districts interested in applying will be held February 15, 2002 at the OSPI Burien office.

Unlike the state program, the Department of Education provided money for mentor training and for evaluation. All administrative and planning costs associated with the state program will be borne out of the PESB budget.

Leave No Child Behind Act:

This act provides a real opportunity for the Transition to Teaching program. Districts may be able to use ESEA funds to run alternative routes. We will be meeting with OSPI about how to access the funds collaboratively.

Legislative Agenda

The PESB will have two bills before the legislature this year:

- One asking for a change with regards to hiring principals; and
- One asking for a technical fix to the staggering of the terms. This bill will also extend the timeline on the subject knowledge test to 2005 to accommodate the State Board adoption of the endorsement competencies.

Budget

- Salaries and wages have been encumbered for the rest of the year.
- Ability of the chair to have release time –this change would have to be made by the legislature.
- We are working on billing OSPI for the \$46,001 shown in our budget as a negative number. This money is what the PEAC committee used to receive to operate.

Status of PESB Open Positions

We are hoping to have the vacant positions filled by the March meeting

Proposed Retreat

We are planning a one-day retreat for the PESB on being a board and board relations. The goal of this retreat will be to discuss our vision and mission and where we see the Board going.

Meeting Schedule:

Mar 12 & 13, 2002 – Burien

May 14 & 15, 2002 – Spokane

July 10 & 11, 2002 – Olympia

September 24 & 25 2002 -Yakima

November 12 & 13, 2002 - Burien

January 21 & 22, 2003 - Olympia

March 11 & 12, 2003 – Mt. Vernon

May 13 & 14, 2003 – Wenatchee

Compensation Workgroup:

The Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) will be putting the information about the compensation conference up on their website.

www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre/conference/conference/nov01

Each workgroup member attended different sessions. On January 15, the workgroup will meet and discuss the sessions each member attended.

WASHINGTON FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

Dan Sherman, the Executive Director of the Washington Federation of Independent Schools (WFIS) presented on

- The WFIS work plan;
- The recommendation from WFIS that the PESB continue its outstanding commitment to creativity and innovation by generating designs that allow for full participation by all of Washington's professional educators; and

- The request from WFIS that the PESB convene a standing committee charged with analyzing the initiatives of the Board, recommending actions and policies to ensure smooth articulation between sectors and equitable application of opportunities (with special emphasis in the areas of mentoring, professional development and options for internships, field-based partnerships and development plans).

Mr. Sherman would like to see a formal process set up to figure out how to make everything equally accessible and possible

Dr. Livingston suggested it might be more appropriate for WFIS to set up a subcommittee to look into this. Then through their membership on the PESB ensure the substance of the conversation reflects the WFIS stance. Mr. Sherman agreed to do this.

ALTERNATIVE ROUTE WORKGROUP

The members of the Alternative Route Workgroup are, Ken Evans, Ron Scutt, Yvonne Ullas, and Carolyn Bradley.

Ken Evans introduced Tom Niland and Moyra Mesa. Ms. Mesa spoke to the PESB about her desire participate in an alternate route to teaching certification and teach.

Ron Scutt reviewed the Fundamental Principles Evident of the New Jersey Model of Teacher Certification.

1. The New Jersey model has been working as an alternative route to certification for seventeen years.
2. The program, first viewed with a high degree of antipathy by many in New Jersey's educational community, is now generally accepted throughout the State.
3. The program has produced more minority recruits in urban and suburban settings.
4. There are more candidates with advanced degrees and higher test scores entering the teaching field.
5. The percentage of alternative route prepared teachers is about 25%. It would seem the New Jersey model and the alternative certification models have coexisted without experiencing the demise of higher education programs.
6. The program has increased the number of applicants and the state does not have "out of endorsement area" teaching.
7. Studies done on the program during the first five years of its existence found that the first year attrition rate for teachers was lower for the alternative route than for the traditional route.

8. The New Jersey model supports itself from a fiscal standpoint and does not rely on tax dollars voted upon by the legislators on a yearly basis. In New Jersey, the applicant pays \$2000 for admission (\$1000 paid to the state for programming, and \$1000 is paid to the applicant's mentor.)
9. The teacher's union in New Jersey has been supportive of the program

Ken Evans provided a PowerPoint presentation in which he gave an overview of the New Jersey model for alternative routes to teacher certification. A copy of this presentation is available in hard copy or from our website under the meeting minutes tab. <http://www.pesb.wa.gov/minutes/index.htm>

Tom Niland from the Richard Stockton College in New Jersey provided background information on the New Jersey program.

Governor Thomas Kane was interested in alternative routes to teacher certification and asked Dr. Leo Klagholz the director of the New Jersey Teacher Preparation and Certification division to look into who is certified in New Jersey.

The alternate route in New Jersey was driven by the findings of the Division of Teacher Preparation and Credentials research. It showed that in the institutions in New Jersey that prepare teachers, whether they were private or state operated, SAT scores of people that were majoring in teacher education in the undergraduate schools were the lowest of any major that those colleges offered. The state colleges had their own freshman testing to see if remediation was needed. The lowest achievers on those tests were the people who were majoring in education. New Jersey wasn't looking at a teacher shortage problem, rather a "graying" teacher population with almost 50% eligible to retire in 10 years and the lowest achievers in line to take their place.

In New Jersey, three issues drove the creation of alternative routes:

1. Teacher quality;
 2. Recruiting for diversity; and
 3. Quantity.
- No one in New Jersey is certified until after they have successfully completed the first year or provisional year.
 - There must be documentation of positive impact on student learning, certified by the school principal.
 - The New Jersey Principal and Administrator Association controls who is certified in New Jersey.
 - The Principal chooses the mentor. Mr. Niland cautioned the Board not to put in so many requisites to become a mentor that you end up with a person who may not be the one you want.
 - Each mentor receives \$1000.

In 1985, traditionally prepared teachers were certified upon graduation. They did not have a mentored internship. Dr. Klagholz was able to show the retention rate was higher among the first group of provisional teachers than traditionally prepared teachers. He hypothesized this was due in part to two factors:

1. Candidates made the decision to teach later in life
2. Candidates had dealt with stress prior to teaching

After seeing the low attrition rate for the alternate route teachers, Governor Kane asked that the provisional year be applied to everyone whether they were prepared traditionally or through an alternate route.

When asked what he would do differently, Mr. Niland said he would relax about checks and balances.

The Board was given the opportunity to ask questions of Mr. Niland. Below are the bulleted points taken from Mr. Niland's answers.

- The instructional portion is partly offered by higher education.
- The principals affirm the objective has been met. There is not as strong of a link as in Washington to show that the person has had an impact on student learning. The principal must count on the department heads to provide feedback on the provisional teacher's performance.
- New Jersey does not have peer evaluation in their program.
- There is an appeal process for those candidates who are not approved. They can appeal directly to the State Board of Examiners for due process.
- The principal is the sole evaluator and the association had no qualms over taking on this responsibility.
- Many people who choose to leave before completion do so because they were put into an impossible position.
- There is a 60-day clause in everyone's contract, including the mentors.
- The disapproval rate is not high.
- The number of alternative route teachers is evenly spread across the school districts.
- The Board of Examiners can grant experiences for credit.
- New Jersey has eliminated emergency certificates in areas other than, Special Education, ESL, and Bilingual/Bicultural education because you cannot receive certification in these areas. However, New Jersey is looking into allowing Special Education into the alternative route program because they are a vulnerable population that may be underserved.
- The New Jersey alternate route program is self-supporting. Candidates pay \$2100 to participate. The district may choose to pay this.
- Student achievement has not dropped.
- The mentoring program has a required 200 hours prior to certification.
- For the 2000-2001 school year, 2200 teachers were prepared through the alternative route program in New Jersey.
 - 109 in math
 - 105 in biology
 - 77 in physical sciences
 - 45 in music
 - 20 in earth sciences
 - 60 in business
 - 1200 in elementary education

WASHINGTON STATE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

Barbara McLain from the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) discussed the review process of the Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification – Partnership Grant Program.

WSIPP is required to provide an interim report in December 2002. Ms. McLain provided a handout outlining the study.

The Legislature articulated four primary objectives for alternative routes. WSIPP will evaluate whether or not the alternative routes programs have met these objectives:

1. High-quality preparation based on intensive, field-based training, coursework and strong mentoring;
2. Flexibility and expedience for candidates, including a focus on demonstration competencies;
3. Assisting in filling teacher shortages in certain subject areas and geographic locations; and
4. The expectation that alternative route candidates meet the same state standards for certification as regularly prepared candidates.

Ms. McLain is trying to find a way to examine some of the teacher development plan.

One of the limitations in relying on questionnaires it is hard to rely on them for objective evidence. Would like to find a way to review and compare some hard evidence of these teachers, possibly by viewing their portfolios. In doing so, we need to find a way for it to be credible without being overly cumbersome. We need to find a way for the difference in programs not to be reflected in the differences in candidates.

Other issues PESB members asked Ms. McLain to research in reviewing the alternative routes program are as follows:

- Mentoring - what kind of support they are receiving, how are they bringing in new ideas, are there lesson plans to make sure they are addressing certain items?
- How well is this program addressing the needs/issues of urban and geographic remote districts? Is this model accommodating to districts in these areas?
- How do candidates who have gone through a traditional route vs. those who have gone through an alternative route compare? How good do the alternative route candidates feel about what they are doing and how well prepared do they feel?
- Did the principal make the student teacher comfortable in the new environment?
- Are there any unintended consequences? Please help the PESB identify if there are any.
- Are these people more apt to assume leadership roles sooner because of the mentoring they received?

Chair Charouhas called for adjournment.

January 9 2002

Members Present: Tom Charouhas, Chair Elaine Aoki
Carolyn Bradley Carol Coar
Nancy Diaz-Miller Sheila Fox
Tim Knue Gary Livingston
Kathryn Nelson Helen Nelson-Throssell
Martha Rice Ron Scutt
Karen Simpson Dennis Sterner
Yvonne Ullas

Members Absent: Terry Bergeson Ken Evans

Staff Present: Jennifer Wallace Pamela Abbott
David Anderson

Chair Charouhas called the Board to order at 8:30am

MINUTES

MOTION: Moved by Tim Knue, seconded by Dr. Sheila Fox to approve the November 2001 minutes as amended. **Motion passed unanimously.**

MOTION: Moved by Martha Rice, seconded by Nancy Diaz-Miller to approve the December 2001 minutes. **Motion passed unanimously.**

NEW JERSEY MODEL

Chair Charouhas asked Mr. Scutt to meet with the alternative certificate group. In March, he would like the group to present to the Board and have the Board decide exactly what to do on this issue.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Dr. Anderson informed the Board that the basic skills test needs a name.

The State Board of Education is scheduled to adopt the new endorsement competencies at their January meeting. Since the subject knowledge test is based on these competencies, the adoption of the competencies must occur prior to issuing the RFP. We will give the vendors 5-6 weeks to respond, enough time to review the proposals, and at the May meeting we will entertain the selection of the vendor. In the summer we can begin work on the test.

David provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Content Knowledge RFP. This presentation can be downloaded at www.pesb.wa.gov/minutes/index.htm

Credit hours will go away because of the shift towards an endorsement-based system.

Mr. Scutt asked if the Board could see both the basic skills test and the subject matter test and possibly take the pilot of each. Dr. Anderson felt this may be appropriate.

CONTENT KNOWLEDGE RFP

Dr. Anderson reviewed RFP for the content knowledge test with the Board and made changes where appropriate.

The Board discussed the name of the test.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dr. Margit Maguire from Seattle University spoke to the Board. Dr. Maguire expressed concern that the State is installing barriers to the profession in the midst of a teacher shortage. She also expressed concern that anyone looking to add an endorsement may have to take the content knowledge test. Dr. Maguire is concerned that the supporting endorsements would be going away and for anyone to be endorsed they would have to have the equivalent of a major. She asked the Board to consider, in light of the federal legislation requiring everyone to teach in endorsement area within 4 years, to look at a supporting endorsement and allow someone to teach out of endorsement area.

Dr. Maguire expressed concern over the number of times the basic skills test would be offered. She fears the Board's decision of six times a year may be problematic.

Gary King of the Washington Education Association encouraged the Board to be global in their thinking. Mr. King felt the annual report really reflected the work the Board had done and reflected the contribution the Board has made to the education process and to education policy.

Mr. King urged the Board to start advising the State Board on the professional education of educators. WEA has held forums with legislators to talk about these issues. 1st, 2nd and 3rd year teachers are outraged that they have to reach professional level certification.

Warren Smith State Board of Education member from the 9th congressional district provided the Board with a letter and commended the Board on an excellent annual report.

Rainer Houser from AWSP spoke to the Board and expressed his appreciation for the work of the Board. For three years AWSP has been working on reorganizing the role of the principalship. AWSP has engaged the Governor's office, OSPI and created a plan.

The principal is a clearly a performance based leader with clear outcomes. As the Board raises questions in the leadership section, they will recognize the role is changing.

Mr. Hauser believes there is not a yes or no answer to the question whether leaders can only come from the teaching ranks. This is something that is undergoing a great deal of discussion.

AWSP is committed to high standards of certification. It has become harder and harder to get people into the principalship. The issue of accountability is becoming a huge issue. In reference to future discussion, AWSP wants certification, but certification based on the standards they are currently working on.

AWSP supports an initial change in the current law to provide for educational staff associates with demonstrated successful school based experience to enter a principal preparation program in lieu of a teaching certificate. AWSP also supports continued study regarding preparation of candidates outside of education.

CONTENT KNOWLEDGE RFP (continued)

Discussion regarding the subject knowledge test continued after public comment. It was determined that the content knowledge test will be taken prior to internship.

Dr. Anderson also explained that the Attorney General's office is looking into the ownership issue of the test. Typically anything developed for the State becomes property of the State.

MOTION: Moved by Carol Coar and seconded by Carolyn Bradley to use WEST as the name of the basic skills test. **Motion passed unanimously.**

MOTION: Moved by Sheila Fox and seconded by Tim Knue to amend the motion to read West-B for basic skills and WEST-E for endorsements. **Motion passed unanimously.**

MOTION: Moved by Dr. Gary Livingston and seconded by Dr. Sheila Fox to move the RFP forward as amended by the Board. **Motion passed unanimously.**

SITE VISITS FOR EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Dr. Lin Douglas from OSPI provided training to the members on Site visits for educator preparation programs.

Chair Charouhas called for adjournment at 3:30pm.